REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on January 11, 2006. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10,11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,282, "Provino) in view of Kang (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,368) and further in view of Stancil (U.S. Patent No. 5,951,685).

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6

Applicants respectfully submit that none of Provino, Kang and Stancil teaches or suggests, providing to the second computing system unit "at least one of the received information stored in the memory before the receipt of the initial request", and "at least one of the received information received subsequent to the initial request," as recited in claim 1.

Provino discloses that the registry provides a stored identifier entry for an identifier or if one is not found, an error value, upon a function call. (Provino, col. 4, lines 61-67). Provino does not disclose that the stored entry is received information received subsequent to the initial request.

Kang does not supply this missing element. Kang merely discloses a user interface device for a PC system capable of converting user interface data transmitted form an external input device to data that can be recognized by the PC system. Kang is also silent about providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received subsequent to the request.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, neither Provino nor Kang teaches "providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received

subsequent to the initial request," as recited in claim 1. (Office Action dated 01/11/06, p. 3, ¶4). The Examiner relies on Stancil to supply this missing element.

Stancil discloses:

> [A] computer system having a processor is provided with a serial-access PROM for storing BIOS code, a memory controller serially connected to the PROM for retrieving BIOS code from the PROM, and a PROM serial interface of the memory controller for allowing communication between the serial-access PROM and the memory controller. In the present invention, BIOS code may be retrieved from the serial PROM either during the boot-up process using a random-access memory controller or prior to the boot-up process using an auto-configuring memory controller. During the boot-up process, the random-access memory controller randomly accesses BIOS code in the serial PROM responsive to CPU read requests. If the memory controller cannot immediately process the CPU's read request, the controller creates wait states for the CPU. Alternatively, prior to boot-up, the auto-configuring memory controller auto-detects the base memory and auto-configures itself to sequentially load the entire contents of the serial PROM into a portion of base memory. Thus, the entire serial PROM is read in one read operation eliminating random accesses to the PROM.

(Stancil, col. 3, lines 15-36) (emphasis added).

Thus, Stancil discloses loading BIOS code during power-up of a computer system from a serial-access PROM using a memory controller. Loading BIOS code during power-up is not equivalent to "providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received subsequent to the initial request," where the received information one of error information, status information, and configuration information.

Thus, none of Provino, Kang and Stancil teach or suggest "providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received subsequent to the initial request."

Applicants further submit that the combination of Provino, Kang and Stancil is improper. The Examiner has stated that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Provino, Kang and Stancil because Stancil's at least one of received information stored in memory before

the receipt of the initial request would improve the efficiency of Provino and Kang's systems by allowing the entire serial of device unit is read in one read operation eliminating random access to the device unit." (Office Action dated 11/11/06, p. 4, ¶5).

While it is true that the system disclosed in Stancil has the objective of eliminating random access to a ROM, there is no motivation in Stancil to combine the disclosure of Stancil with the disclosure of Provino and Kang. Stancil makes no suggestion that the disclosed serial-access PROM could be used to provide to a second computing system unit received information stored in the memory before the receipt of an initial request and received information received subsequent to the initial request. The Examiner appears to have merely taken a desired end result, as recited in Applicant's claims, and stated that a combination of multiple references achieves this end result. Such a position is impermissible hindsight. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner point to the required intrinsic or extrinsic motivation within the references themselves, or within knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to form such a combination.

Further, the Examiner has acknowledged that Provino does not teach receiving "information comprising at least one of error information, status information, and configuration information." (Office Action dated 01/11/06, p. 4, ¶4). The Examiner relies on Kang to supply this missing element. However, Kang merely discloses receiving and transmitting "key code data." (e.g., Kang, col. 3, lines 43-47). The "key code data" is key code data corresponding to the radio signal received from the remote controller and supplied to the interface controller. (Kang, col. 1, lines 46-47, col. 3; lines 42-46). Kang does not teach or suggest that the key code data is one of "error information, status information, and configuration information", as claimed.

Stancil does not supply the missing limitations. Stancil does not teach or suggest receiving "information comprising at least one of error information, status information, and configuration information," as claimed.

Thus, none of Provino, Kang and Stancil, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 and associated dependent claims are not obvious over this combination.

Claims 10, 11, 14, 15

As discussed above, Provino, Kang, and Stancil, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received subsequent to the initial request. Further, Provino, Kang, and Stancil, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest "one of error information, status information, and configuration information", as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 10 and dependent claims 11, 14, 15 are not obvious over this combination.

Claims 19, 20, 23, and 24

As discussed above, Provino, Kang and Stancil, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received subsequent to the initial request. Further, Provino, Kang and Stancil, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest "one of error information, status information, and configuration information", as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 19 and dependent claims 20, 23-24 are not obvious over this combination.

Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 21, 22

Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 21, 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provino in view of Kang and Stancil and further in view of PI (Persistor CF1 User's Manual BIOS Management Calls). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 21, 22.

PI discloses BIOS management calls. P1 does not teach or suggest the providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received subsequent to the initial request, as claimed in claims 1, 10 and 19. Further, P1 also does not teach or suggest "one of error information, status information, and configuration information", as claimed.

Thus, as none of Provino, Kang, Stancil and P1 teaches each and every limitation of claims 1, 10 and 19, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 21, 22, which depend from one of independent claims 1, 10 and 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 7-9, 16-18, 25-27

Claims 7-9, 16-18, 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provino et al. in view of Kang and Stancil and further in view of OSR (Using the NT Registry for Driver Install). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 17-9, 16-18, and 25-27.

OSR discloses an NT device driver writer. OSR does not teach or suggest the providing to the second computing system unit at least one of the received information received subsequent to the initial request, as claimed in claims 1, 10 and 19. Further, OSR does not teach or suggest "one of error information, status information, and configuration information", as claimed.

Thus, as none of Provino, Kang, Stancil or OSR teaches each and every limitation of claims 1, 10 and 19, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 7-9, 16-18, 25-27, which depend from one of independent claims 1, 10 and 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. A petition for an extension of time is submitted with this amendment. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Tom Ferrill at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April 11, 2006

Thomas S. Ferrill
Reg. No. 42,532
Tel.:(408) 720-8300

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026